

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FREDERICK SCHIFF,
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

No. C-03-4345 MMC
No. C-04-2261 MMC
No. C-04-2262 MMC

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFFS TO
LODGE CHAMBERS COPY IN
COMPLIANCE WITH GENERAL
ORDER 45 AND THE COURT'S
STANDING ORDERS**

NARDA GILLESPIE et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

MARK OSUNA,
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

/

1 On September 19, 2005, plaintiffs electronically filed their joint opposition to
2 defendant Fred Lau's motion for summary adjudication. Plaintiffs have violated General
3 Order 45 and the Court's standing orders, however, by failing to deliver to the Clerk's Office
4 "no later than noon on the business day following the day that the papers are filed
5 electronically, one paper copy of each document that is filed electronically . . . marked
6 'Chambers Copy' and . . . clearly marked with the judge's name, case number, and
7 'Chambers Copy-Do Not File.'" See General Order 45 § VII.G; see also Standing Orders
8 For Civil Cases Assigned to The Honorable Maxine M. Chesney ¶ 2.

9 Plaintiffs are hereby ORDERED to comply with General Order 45 and the Court's
10 standing orders by immediately submitting a chambers copy of the above-referenced
11 document. The parties are hereby advised that if either party fails in the future to comply
12 with the Court's order to provide chambers copies of electronically-filed documents, the
13 Court may impose sanctions on the noncomplying party, including, but not limited to,
14 striking from the record any electronically-filed document of which a chambers copy has not
15 been timely provided to the Court.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: September 26, 2005


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge